From: Steve Skipper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:30pm
Subject: Settlement agreement

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of Washington I am amused at the different states' AG's as they attack Microsoft. Even though our AG was a lead litigator in the tobacco suit(we grow no tobacco in WA), I notice our AG is not part of this action, but many of the other AG's have competitors to Microsoft headquartered in their states. This appears to be a legal shakedown, because many of them were happy if Microsoft dumped money into their state in exchange for settling. (If it were truly an anti-trust case, none of these pursuers would let Microsoft buy them off.) Is this the American way? I hope not.

I would like to mention just one little piece of testimony in the government's case against Microsoft. Ralph Nader in his testimony mentioned that they were so upset with Microsoft's business tactics that they did not use any Microsoft products in their office. I think that says it all. Microsoft is not the only game in town.

I would also like to refer back to another case not so long ago, very similar to this one. Remember when the government claimed that no one would ever be able to compete against IBM, because they controlled so much of the market. A suit that lasted some 13 years was for naught. IBM is even throwing in the towel on trying to compete in the desktop business and it had nothing to do with the government making a level playing field. What was the purpose of the suit? Are we going to make the same mistakes with Microsoft?

The free enterprise system is not perfect, but I think if we look at history, it turns out to be the most efficient and gives competitors the best opportunity to become the new industry giant.

If Microsoft is willing to settle under the terms now proposed, let's do it.

Steve Skipper, Not affiliated with, own no interest in, not an

advocate for or not paid by Microsoft

Do You Yahoo!? Send FREE video emails in Yahoo! Mail! http://promo.yahoo.com/videomail/